arXiv:1406.0429v6 [math.NT] 6 Nov 2015

Periodicity related to a sieve method of producing primes

Haifeng Xu[*], *Zuyi Zhang*, *Jiuru Zhou*

November 9, 2015

Abstract

In this paper we consider a slightly different sieve method from Eratosthenes' to get primes. We find the periodicity and mirror symmetry of the pattern.

MSC2010: 11A41.
Keywords: sieve method, periodicity of pattern, mirror symmetry of pattern.

1 Definitions and Notations

Let $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n, \ldots\}$ be the set of all primes, where p_n denotes the n-th prime number. $\pi(x)$ is the number of primes which are less than or equal to x. $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of positive numbers. Let

$$M_{p_n} = \mathbb{N} - \{2k, 3k, 5k, \ldots, p_n k \mid k \in \mathbb{N}\},$$

and D_{p_n} be the set of difference of two consecutive numbers in M_{p_n}, that is,

$$D_{p_n} = \{d_k \mid d_k = x_{k+1} - x_k, x_i \in M_{p_n}\},$$

where x_i is the i-th number in M_{p_n}.

For example, we list the first few numbers of M_3 and D_3.

M_3	1	5	7	11	13	17	19	23	25	29	31	35	37	...
D_3	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	2	4	...

We call the minimum subset $\mathcal{P}_3 := \{4, 2\}$ of D_3 as the pattern of D_3 since it occurs periodically. We will prove this fact in the next section and also for the general situation. Hence, we put the general definitions of P_{p_n} and T_{p_n} in the proof of Theorem 2.2 due to the induction.

The number of the elements in the pattern $\mathcal{P}_3$ for D_3 is called the period of D_3. We write it as $T_3 = 2$.

The length of the pattern $\mathcal{P}_{p_n}$ is defined as the sum of the elements in the pattern. We write it as $L(\mathcal{P}_{p_n})$.

*Project supported by NSFC(Grant No. 11401515), the University Science Research Project of Jiangsu Province (14KJB110027) and the Foundation of Yangzhou University 2014CXJ004.

2 Periodicity of the pattern

Proposition 2.1. *$M_3 = \{u_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ has the following property:*

$$\begin{cases} u_{2k} = u_{2k-1} + 4, \\ u_{2k+1} = u_{2k} + 2, \end{cases}$$

where $k = 1, 2, \ldots$. In other words, $\{4, 2\}$ is the pattern of D_3, so the period is 2.

Proof. u_n satisfies the equations:

$$\begin{cases} x \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ 2), \\ x \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ 3), \end{cases} \quad \text{or} \quad \begin{cases} x \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ 2), \\ x \equiv 2 (\mathrm{mod}\ 3). \end{cases}$$

The left infers that $x \equiv 1 (\mathrm{mod}\ 6)$. The right is:

$$\begin{cases} x = 2k + 1, \\ x = 3\ell + 2. \end{cases}$$

If $u_n = 2k + 1 = 3\ell + 2$, then $2k = 3\ell + 1$, which infers that ℓ must be odd. Let $\ell = 2h + 1$, then $2k = 3(2h + 1) + 1 = 6h + 4$. Thus $2k + 1 = 6h + 5 = 3\ell + 2$. Hence, $u_n \equiv 5 (\mathrm{mod}\ 6)$. □

Theorem 2.2. *The period of D_p is*

$$T_p = (2 - 1)(3 - 1)(5 - 1) \cdots (p - 1).$$

Proof. We prove this by induction. The case for D_3 has been proved. For simplicity, we try to explain the procedure by proving the case for D_5. First, we observe that

$$M_{p_{n+1}} = M_{p_n} - \{p_{n+1} h \mid h \in M_{p_n}\}.$$

We show this procedure (getting M_5 from M_3) in the following table (see Figure 1).

We need to delete the multiples of 5 in M_3, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{5 \cdot 1}, \quad 5 \cdot 5, \\ &\mathbf{5 \cdot 7}, \quad 5 \cdot 11, \\ &\mathbf{5 \cdot 13}, \quad 5 \cdot 17, \\ &\mathbf{5 \cdot 19}, \quad \ldots \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.1, D_3 has pattern $\{4, 2\}$, hence the positions of the elements needed to delete occur periodically in M_3. The period is $5 \times 6 = 30$, where 6 is the length of the previous patter $\{4, 2\}$.

1	~~5~~	7	11	13	17	19	23	~~25~~	29	31
	~~35~~	37	41	43	47	49	53	~~55~~	59	61
	~~65~~	67	71	73	77	79	83	~~85~~	89	91
	~~95~~	97	101	103	107	109	113	~~115~~	119	121
	~~125~~	127	131	133	137	139	143	~~145~~	149	151
	~~155~~	157	161	163	167	169	173	~~175~~	179	181
	~~185~~	187	191	193	197	199	203	~~205~~	209	211
	~~215~~	217	221	223	227	229	233	~~235~~	239	241
	~~245~~	247	251	253	257	259	263	~~265~~	269	271
	~~275~~	277	281	283	287	289	293	~~295~~	299	301
	~~305~~	307	311	313	317	319	323	~~325~~	329	331
	~~335~~	337	341	343	347	349	353	~~355~~	359	361
	~~365~~	367	371	373	377	379	383	~~385~~	389	391
	~~395~~	397	401	403	407	409	413	~~415~~	419	421
	...									

Figure 1: M_5

From another view, we make 5 copies of the pattern $\{4, 2\}$. Say,

$$4, 2, 4, 2, 4, 2, 4, 2, 4, 2.$$

After deleting 5 and 25, we get the string:

$$(4 + 2), 4, 2, 4, 2, 4, (2 + 4), 2.$$

It is the pattern of D_5, we denote it by $\mathcal{P}_5 = \{6, 4, 2, 4, 2, 4, 6, 2\}$. Hence the period is $T_5 = 8 = 2 \cdot 5 - 2 = (5 - 1) \cdot T_3$.

Hence, we have seen that we give the definition of $\mathcal{P}_{p_n}$ and T_{p_n} inductively. When we prove that D_{p_n} contains a minimum subset $\mathcal{P}_{p_n}$ which occurs periodically, we will prove that $D_{p_{n+1}}$ also contains a minimum subset which is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_{p_{n+1}}$ that occurs periodically. Then, we can define the period $T_{p_{n+1}}$.

To see this fact more clearly, we now show that the pattern of D_7 is

$$\begin{aligned}
&10 = (6, 4), 2, 4, 2, 4, 6, 2;\\
&6, 4, 2, 4, 6 = (2, 4), 6, 2;\\
&6, 4, 2, 6 = (4, 2), 4, 6, 8 = (2, 6);\\
&4, 2, 4, 2, 4, 8 = (6, 2);\\
&6, 4, 6 = (2, 4), 2, 4, 6, 2;\\
&6, 6 = (4, 2), 4, 2, 4, 6, 2;\\
&6, 4, 2, 4, 2, 10 = (4, 6), 2.
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The period is $T_7 = 48 = (7 - 1) \cdot (5 - 1) \cdot (3 - 1) \cdot (2 - 1)$.

In fact, M_7 is obtained by deleting the multiples of 7 in M_5. We can rearrange the numbers in Figure 1 as in Figure 2.

1	7	11	13	17	19	23	29	31	*37*	*41*
	43	*47*	*49*	*53*	*59*	*61*	**67**	**71**	**73**	**77**
	79	**83**	**89**	**91**	*97*	*101*	*103*	*107*	*109*	*113*
	119	*121*	**127**	**131**	**133**	**137**	**139**	**143**	**149**	**151**
	157	*161*	*163*	*167*	*169*	*173*	*179*	*181*	**187**	**191**
	193	**197**	**199**	**203**	**209**	**211**				
	217	221	223	227	229	233	239	241	247	251
	253	257	259	263	269	271	277	281	283	287
	289	293	299	301	307	311	313	317	319	323
	329	331	337	341	343	347	349	353	359	361
	367	371	373	377	379	383	389	391	397	401
	403	407	409	413	419	421				
	427	431	433	437	439	443	449	451	457	461
	463	467	469	473	479	481	487	491	493	497
	499	503	509	511	517	521	523	527	529	533
	539	541	547	551	553	557	559	563	569	571
	577	581	583	587	589	593	599	601	607	611
	613	617	619	623	629	631				
	$\cdots$									

Figure 2: rearranging M_5

We need to delete the multiples of 7 in M_5 (See Figure 3). They are

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{7\cdot 1},\quad 7\cdot 7,\quad 7\cdot 11,\quad 7\cdot 13,\quad 7\cdot 17,\quad 7\cdot 19,\quad 7\cdot 23,\quad 7\cdot 29,\\
&\mathbf{7\cdot 31},\quad 7\cdot 37,\quad 7\cdot 41,\quad 7\cdot 43,\quad 7\cdot 47,\quad 7\cdot 49,\quad 7\cdot 53,\quad 7\cdot 59,\\
&\mathbf{7\cdot 61},\cdots
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have proved that D_5 has period pattern $\{6,4,2,4,2,4,6,2\}$, we can assert that the elements to be deleted above are periodic. Every first item in the period has gap 7×30, where 30 is exactly the length of previous pattern $\{6,4,2,4,2,4,6,2\}$. Therefore, the pattern is obtained in the following way. First copy the previous pattern 7 times, then combine some pairs of consecutive numbers to get a new pattern.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underline{6,4},2,4,2,4,6,2\\
&6,4,2,4,\underline{2,4},6,2\\
&6,4,2,\underline{4,2},4,6,\underline{2}\\
&\underline{6},4,2,4,2,4,\underline{6,2}\\
&6,4,\underline{2,4},2,4,6,2\\
&6,\underline{4,2},4,2,4,6,2\\
&6,4,2,4,2,\underline{4,6},2
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get the pattern of D_7, see (1).

1	~~7~~	11	13	17	19	23	29	31	*37*	*41*
	43	*47*	~~49~~	*53*	*59*	*61*	**67**	**71**	**73**	~~77~~
	79	**83**	**89**	~~91~~	*97*	*101*	*103*	*107*	*109*	*113*
$M_7^{(0)}$	~~119~~	*121*	**127**	**131**	~~133~~	**137**	**139**	**143**	**149**	**151**
	157	~~161~~	*163*	*167*	*169*	*173*	*179*	*181*	**187**	**191**
	193	**197**	**199**	~~203~~	**209**	**211**				
	~~217~~	221	223	227	229	233	239	241	247	251
	253	257	~~259~~	263	269	271	277	281	283	~~287~~
	289	293	299	~~301~~	307	311	313	317	319	323
$M_7^{(1)}$	~~329~~	331	337	341	~~343~~	347	349	353	359	361
	367	~~371~~	373	377	379	383	389	391	397	401
	403	407	409	~~413~~	419	421				
	~~427~~	431	433	437	439	443	449	451	457	461
	463	467	~~469~~	473	479	481	487	491	493	~~497~~
	499	503	509	~~511~~	517	521	523	527	529	533
$M_7^{(2)}$	~~539~~	541	547	551	~~553~~	557	559	563	569	571
	577	~~581~~	583	587	589	593	599	601	607	611
	613	617	619	~~623~~	629	631				
	$\cdots$									

Figure 3: Obtain M_7 from M_5 by deleting the $7h$, $h \in M_5$

If we construct M_{11}, then we will consider the following eleven blocks:

$$M_7^{(0)}, M_7^{(1)}, M_7^{(2)}, \ldots, M_7^{(10)},$$

where we use $M_7^{(0)}$ to denote the first block in M_7 corresponding to the first period of D_7.

Generally, when constructing the new pattern for $D_{p_{n+1}}$ from D_{p_n}, we first take p_{n+1} copies of previous pattern for D_{p_n}. Then the period obeys the recursive formula:

$$T_{p_{n+1}} = p_{n+1} \cdot T_{p_n} - T_{p_n} = (p_{n+1} - 1) \cdot T_{p_n}.$$

According to the induction hypothesis,

$$T_{p_n} = \prod_{i=1}^{n} (p_i - 1),$$

we have

$$T_{p_{n+1}} = \prod_{i=1}^{n+1} (p_i - 1).$$

□

Corollory 2.3. $L(\mathcal{P}_{p_n}) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i$.

Proof. Using $L(\mathcal{P}_{p_n}) = p_n L(\mathcal{P}_{p_{n-1}})$. □

Lemma 2.4. *If $p_n \geqslant 11$ (i.e., $n \geqslant 5$), p_n^2 is contained in the first block of $M_{p_{n-1}}$. (Here the block means the subset of $M_{p_{n-1}}$ corresponding to the $D_{p_{n-1}}$.)*

Proof. First,

$$\begin{aligned} & p_n^2 < p_n + L(\mathcal{P}_{p_{n-1}}) \\ \Leftrightarrow\ & p_n(p_n - 1) < p_{n-1} \cdot p_{n-2} \cdots 5 \cdot 3 \cdot 2. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that $p_k = 11$ satisfies the inequality:

$$p_k(p_k - 1) < p_{k-1} \cdot p_{k-2} \cdots 5 \cdot 3 \cdot 2.$$

By Bertrand's postulate $p_{k+1} < 2p_k$, then it is easy to show that

$$p_{k+1}(p_{k+1} - 1) < p_k \cdot p_{k-1} \cdot p_{k-2} \cdots 5 \cdot 3 \cdot 2$$

also holds if $k \geqslant 5$.

Then we have completed the proof. □

Hence, if $n \geqslant 5$, then the numbers between p_n and p_n^2 which belong to the first block of $M_{p_{n-1}}$ are all primes. In fact, we observe that for any $n \geqslant 1$, for any element $q(> 1)$ in the the first block of $M_{p_{n-1}}$, if q satisfies $p_n < q < p_n^2$, then it is a prime.

Theorem 2.5. *The gap sequence except the last element in the pattern is mirror symmetric.*

Proof. For example, when constructing D_{11} from D_7, we delete the numbers $\{11k \mid k \in M_7\}$. We list the divisors k of the first period. They are

1	11	13	17	19	23	29	31	37	41
43	47	53	59	61	67	71	73	79	83
89	97	101	**103**	∗**107**	109	113	121	127	131
137	139	143	149	151	157	163	167	169	173
179	181	187	191	193	197	199	209		

These 48 numbers are mirror complemental. The sum of every two symmetric numbers about $*$ are equal to 210. More precisely, every block in M_7 are mirror complemental about the center of the block. It infers that the mirror symmetry of the gap sequence except the last element in the pattern $\mathcal{P}_{11}$. Therefore, when constructing $D_{p_{n+2}}$ from $D_{p_{n+1}}$, we conclude that the numbers which to be deleted $\{p_{n+2}k \mid k \in M_{p_{n+1}}\}$ are mirror complemental because the numbers $k \in M_{p_{n+1}}$ corresponding the first period are mirror complemental by the inductive hypothesis. And by inductive hypothesis, the first p_{n+2} blocks in $M_{p_{n+1}}$ are mirror complemental. Therefore, the gap sequence in the pattern $\mathcal{P}_{p_{n+2}}$ except the last number is mirror symmetric. □

By the argument above, we easily have

Corollory 2.6. *The last element in every pattern* $\mathcal{P}_{p_n}$ *is* 2.

Proof. We still illustrate this fact first by the above example. Where the length of the period is 210. Thus the next number of 209 in the second block of M_7 is 211. Thus the last element in $\mathcal{P}_7$ is $2 = 211 - 209$.

Generally, if we use x to denote the last element in the first block of M_{p_n}, then $1 + x = L(\mathcal{P}_{p_n})$ by the mirror complementary. On the other hand, the first element denoted by y in the second block of M_{p_n} satisfies that $y - 1 = L(\mathcal{P}_{p_n})$. Thus, $y - x = 2$ which is just the last element of the patter $\mathcal{P}_{p_n}$. □

Theorem 2.7. *(i) The multiplicities of skips* 2 *and* 4 *are always same and odd. (ii) The central gap is always* 4*, and the multiplicities of all gaps except* 2 *and* 4 *are even.*

Proof. (i) In fact, these multiplicities for k-prime basis, $k > 1$, are both precisely equal to

$$(3-2)\cdot(5-2)\cdots(p_k-2), \tag{2}$$

which is always odd as well. For example, there are 15 skips 2 in the pattern $\mathcal{P}_7$ (see (1)).

For element x in M_{p_k}, we consider the residues of $2, 3, 5, 7, \ldots, p_k$ respectively, i.e.,

$$x \equiv (x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_k) \mod (p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_k),$$

and for simplicity we write it as a vector $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_k)$.

The multiplicity of skip 2 is easily obtained by noting that some integer $x = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_k)$ is the first relatively prime (r-prime) before skip 2, iff x has residues of the form $(1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_k)$ where no x_i is 0 or -2. (If $x_i = 0$, then x is a multiple of p_i which will not in M_{p_k} for $i \leqslant k$. Similarly, if $x_i = -2$, then $x_i + 2$ is a multiple of p_i.) Since number of such k-tuples with 2 forbidden values on the upper $k-1$ residues is $(3-2)\cdot(5-2)\cdots(p_k-2)$, that is the multiplicity of skip 2.

Similarly, for skip 4, the integer x is the first r-prime before skip 4 iff it has residues of the form $(1, x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_k)$ where no x_i is 0 or -4, yielding the above multiplicity with the two forbidden values on $x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_k$.

Note that the above simple method doesn't work for skips larger than 4 since these can be obtained both via replication (by increasing k) and via merging of adjacent skips which follows replication. In contrast, for $k > 1$, skips 2 and 4 can be obtained only via replication (with growing k), but not via skip merging during filtering, since skip subsequences $2, 2$ cannot occur for $k > 1$ (the replicated residue pattern for $k > 1$ is $2, 4, 2, 4, \ldots$).

(ii) Regarding the formula above (2) for multiplicities of gaps 2 and 4, the second statement of (ii) (the multiplicities of all gaps except 2 and 4 are even) is true. This follows easily from the mirror symmetry (which is easiest seen as symmetry gaps with respect to change of signs of residues) and the fact that the central gap (which could straddle the symmetry center and mirror into itself) is always 4. (End gap is always 2, and these are the only 2 exceptions.) Regarding the latter clause, for a k-prime basis $p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \ldots, p_k$, the central integer

(symmetry axis) is at $C = 3{\cdot}5\cdots p_k$ and its residue pattern is $C = (1, 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$. The integers around C are then in residue form as follows:

$$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrl}
C-2: & -1 & -2 & -2 & -2 & \ldots & -2 & \text{r-prime} \\
C-1: & 0 & -1 & -1 & -1 & \ldots & -1 & \text{r-composite} \\
C: & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & \text{r-composite} \\
C+1: & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \text{r-composite} \\
C+2: & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \ldots & 2 & \text{r-prime}
\end{array}$$

which always has 2 r-primes at $C \pm 2$, and 3 r-composites at $C, C \pm 1$, yielding thus gap 4 at the symmetry axis. The mirror symmetry around C then implies the second statement. □

Remark 2.8. The largest skip comes in pairs only up to first 8 basis primes (i.e. up to $\mathcal{P}_{19}$), but already for the 9 prime basis ($\mathcal{P}_{23}$) the largest skip is 40 which occurs 12 times. Beyond the 9 prime basis, the longest pattern occurs in pairs only for 3 more cases: 10, 11 and 13 basis primes i.e. $\mathcal{P}_{29}$, $\mathcal{P}_{31}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{41}$. All other cases have larger multiplicities of the longest skip.

Note also that for the basis with first k primes $p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \ldots, p_k$, the trivial low bound for the max skip is $2p_{k-1}$, e.g. for the set $\mathcal{P}_{13}(k = 6)$, the low bound is $2 \cdot 11 = 22$ which happens to be the actual longest skip for $\mathcal{P}_{13}$.

The general residue pattern for solution meeting this low bound with k prime basis is $(0, 0, 0, ...0, \mp 1, \pm 1)$, where first $k - 2$ residues are 0, and last two are $+1$ and -1 or -1 and $+1$ (which corresponds to the two solutions). The two longest patterns occur only when this low bound $2p_{k-1}$ is met, otherwise there are more than 2 maxima (again there is even number of solutions due to mirror symmetry).

For the 9 prime basis ($\mathcal{P}_{23}$), the above low bound is $2 \cdot 19 = 38$, while the max skip is 40, hence the low bound defect is $40 - 38 = 2$. The max skip is 100 for $\mathcal{P}_{47}$, while the low bound is $2 \cdot 43 = 86$, yielding defect 14. The max skip is 200 for $\mathcal{P}_{79}$ while the low bound is $2 \cdot 73 = 146$, yielding defect 54. The max skip is 300 for $\mathcal{P}_{107}$ (28 primes basis), while low bound is $2 \cdot 103 = 206$, defect 94. The max skip is 414 (i.e. the first $\geqslant 400$) for $\mathcal{P}_{139}$ (34 primes basis), while low bound is $2 \cdot 137 = 274$, defect 140. The max skip is 510 (the first $\geqslant 500$) for $\mathcal{P}_{167}$ (39 primes basis), defect 184, etc.

Conjecture 2.9. 6 is the number that occurs the most times in any pattern $\mathcal{P}_{p_n}$ when $n \geqslant 11$.

Remark 2.10. Let $t_{p_{n+1}}$ denote the multiplicity of 2 in the pattern for $D_{p_{n+1}}$, then we get a recurrence inequality,

$$t_{p_{n+1}} \geqslant t_{p_n} \cdot p_{n+1} - T_{p_n}.$$

But it is a rough estimate. In fact, by equation (2), we have

$$t_{p_{n+1}} > T_{p_n}.$$

3 Application to get consecutive primes

Based on the above discussion, to obtain the pattern for D_{p_n}, we first take p_n copies of the previous pattern for $D_{p_{n-1}}$. Then, delete the corresponding elements $p_n h$ in $M_{p_{n-1}}$, where $h \in M_{p_{n-1}}$. These elements to be deleted are distributed in the following way. The number of them is $T_{p_{n-1}}$.



Here $\mathcal{P}_{p_{n-1}} = \{d^1_{p_{n-1}}, d^2_{p_{n-1}}, \ldots, d^{T_{p_{n-1}}}_{p_{n-1}}\}$ is the pattern for $D_{p_{n-1}}$. The red points are just the elements to be deleted. The blue point q_n denotes the biggest prime which is less than p_n^2. The last green point is also deleted. But it is regarded as in the next period.

Proposition 3.1. *The numbers in the set*

$$\{q \in M_{p_{n-1}} \mid p_n < q < p_n p_{n+1}, \quad q \neq p_n^2\}$$

are consecutive primes.

If there exist at least one gap 2 in the pattern $\mathcal{P}_{p_{n-1}}$ located in the subset corresponding to the interval $[p_{n+1}, q_n]$. Then, this gap 2 is kept in the next pattern $\mathcal{P}_{p_n}$, and also in the subset corresponding to the interval $[p_{n+1}, q_n]$.

Theorem 3.2. *Let c be a positive integer. Define a characteristic function for each interval $I_k = [(k-1)c, kc)$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ as follows:*

$$\chi_{I_k} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } I_k \text{ contains one or more primes,} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If m is large enough, and if $c \geqslant 3$, then

$$\frac{1}{c}\pi(mc) \leqslant \sum_{k=1}^{m} \chi_{I_k} < \pi(mc),$$

that is,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} \chi_{I_k} \asymp \frac{m}{\ln m}.$$

Proof. Let $J_{ki}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, c$ be the subintervals in I_k, each J_{ki} has the form $[d, d+1)$. Then,

$$\chi_{I_k} = \max_{1 \leqslant i \leqslant c} \chi_{J_{ki}}.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} \chi_{I_k} = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \max_i \chi_{J_{ki}} \geqslant \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{1}{c} \sum_{i=1}^{c} \chi_{J_{ki}} = \frac{1}{c}\pi(mc).$$

On the other hand, it is obvious that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} \chi_{I_k} < \pi(mc) \quad \text{for } c \geqslant 3.$$

□

Yitang Zhang [9] proved the following result for consecutive primes based on the recent work of Goldston, Pintz and Yıldırım [2, 3] on the small gaps between consecutive primes.

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}(p_{n+1} - p_n) < H, \tag{3}$$

where $H = 7 \times 10^7$. Then it was reduced to 4680 by Polymath project [4, 7]. In late 2013, James Maynard and Terry Tao found a much simpler proof of Zhang's result giving $H = 600$. A further progress based on this work has reduced H to 252 by Polymath project[1]. As of April 14, 2014, one year after Zhang's announcement, according to the Polymath project wiki, the bound has been reduced to 246.

Hence, for $c \geqslant 246$, we have

Proposition 3.3. *There are infinitely many pairs $m_2 > m_1 > 0$, m_2 and m_1 are large enough, such that*

$$\frac{1}{c}(\pi(m_2c) - \pi(m_1c)) \leqslant \sum_{k=m_1}^{m_2} \chi_{I_k} < \pi(m_2c) - \pi(m_1c).$$

Conjecture 3.4. For any $m_2 > m_1 > 0$, m_2 and m_1 are large enough, and any $c > 2$, we have

$$\frac{1}{c}(\pi(m_2c) - \pi(m_1c)) \leqslant \sum_{k=m_1}^{m_2} \chi_{I_k} < \pi(m_2c) - \pi(m_1c).$$

Acknowledgments : We express our gratitude to Mr. Ratko V. Tomic (a researcher in Infinetics Technologies, Inc) who pointed out the mirror symmetry of the gap sequence which is stated in Theorem 2.5. And also he gives the proof of Theorem 2.7 and makes the remark 2.8. We thank him for discussing the question and introducing us the ideas involved.

References

[1] Ben Green, *Bounded gaps between primes*, arXiv:1402.4849v2.

[2] D. A. Goldston, J. Pintz, C. Y. Yıldırım, Primes in tuples I, *Ann. of Math.* (2) **170** (2009), no. 2, 819–862.

[3] D. A. Goldston, J. Pintz, C. Y. Yıldırım, Primes in tuples II, *Acta Math.* **204** (2010), 1–47.

[4] A. Granville, *Primes in intervals of bounded length*, to appear.

[5] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, Oxford University Press, 2008.

[6] Laurentiu Panaitopol, *Inequalities concerning the function $\pi(x)$: Applications*, Acta Arithmetica, 2000, 4.

[7] D. H. J. Polymath, *New equidistribution estimates of Zhang type, and bounded gaps between primes*, arXiv:1402.0811v1, 4 Feb 2014.

[8] J. B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, *Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers*, Illinois J. Math., **6** (1962), 64-94.

[9] Yitang Zhang, *Bounded gaps between primes*, Ann. of Math. **179**(3) (2014), 1121–1174.

Haifeng Xu
School of Mathematical Science
Yangzhou University
Jiangsu China 225002
hfxu@yzu.edu.cn

Zuyi Zhang
Department of Mathematics
Suqian College
Jiangsu China 225002
zhangzuyi1993@hotmail.com

Jiuru Zhou
School of Mathematical Science
Yangzhou University
Jiangsu China 225002
zhoujr1982@hotmail.com